

Serial No.: 10/529,500
Docket No.: 28955.1047

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-14, as amended, remain herein. Claims 3 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3. New claims 8-14 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the specification (see, e.g., Example 1 at page 31 of the specification).

1. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 7 has been cancelled thereby mooting this rejection.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Eida et al. U.S. Patent 5,909,081. The Office Action states that Figure 6 of Eida '081 discloses a first passivation layer (6) and a second passivation layer (10).

Eida '081 does not disclose two passivation layers as required in applicants' claims and as defined in applicants' specification. Eida '081 discloses layer 6 which is a gap (see Eida '081 at column 21, lines 53-63) and layer 10 which is an adhesive layer (see Example 5 of Eida '081 at column 34, lines 22-30 (stating that an adhesive was applied over the entire substrate after the protective layer 7 was applied)).

Applicants' specification states that with "two passivation layers, a pinhole pass can be effectively blocked, thereby enhancing the sealing properties" (see Abstract). In addition, applicants provide examples of materials for the passivation layer including transparent resins, sealing liquids and transparent inorganic materials (page 20, lines 14-16 of applicants'

Serial No.: 10/529,500
Docket No.: 28955.1047

specification). A gap or an adhesive are not passivation layers as defined in applicants' specification.

New claims 8-14 are further patentable because Eida '081 does not disclose an organic electroluminescent display including a thin film transistor.

Thus, Eida '081 does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

3. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Yamazaki et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0125817. The Office Action states that Figure 3 of Yamazaki discloses a first passivation layer (207) and a second passivation layer (10). But neither Yamazaki nor the Office Action explains what Yamazaki's second layer is, and Yamazaki Figure 3 does not show any layer (10). Thus, Yamazaki does not disclose two passivation layers, as required in applicants' claims, and as defined in applicants' specification.

Thus, Yamazaki does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not an adequate basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

4. Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Inoue et al. U.S. Patent 6,111,355. The Office Action states that Figure 5 of Inoue discloses a first

Serial No.: 10/529,500
Docket No.: 28955.1047

passivation layer (17) and a second passivation layer (7) with an intermediate layer 11.

Inoue does not disclose two passivation layers, as required in applicants' claims, and as defined in applicants' specification. Applicants' specification states that with "two passivation layers, a pinhole pass can be effectively blocked, thereby enhancing the sealing properties" (see Abstract). As explained in applicants' specification, the passivation layer performs a sealing function, and prevents undesired materials and impurities contained in the color conversion layers from penetrating and transmitting into the organic EL elements (see page 2, lines 12-16 of the specification). Inoue's layers 7 and 17, which are a spacer layer and an adhesive layer, respectively, are not continuous layers, and thus they cannot perform the sealing function of a passivation layer as defined in applicants' specification.

In addition, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, the insulating liquid 11 does not form an intermediate layer between Inoue's layers 7 and 17.

Thus, Inoue does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not an adequate basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

5. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Eida '081.

As discussed above, Eida '081 does not disclose two passivation layers, as required in applicants' claims. Thus, Eida '081 does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, Eida '081 discloses nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Eida

Serial No.: 10/529,500
Docket No.: 28955.1047

'081, or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, this application is now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28955.1047). If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: April 10, 2008

Houda MORAD
Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Houda Morad
Reg. No. 56,742

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-429-3000
Fax: 202-429-3902